The Effectiveness of Case-Management Interventions for the Homeless, Vulnerably Housed and Persons with Lived Experience: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.

Appendix VI: GRADE Tables

Appendix 5.1: SCM GRADE Evidence Profiles

			Certainty assessn	nent			Nº of p	atients	Ef	fect	Certainty	Importance
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Case Management	Comparison	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Outcome: Ho	ousing Stability						•					
Percentage o	f participants homel	ess (Shumway 2008	3) (follow up: 24 mon	ths)								
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	38/141 (27.0%)	21/85 (24.7%)	OR 1.12 (0.61 to 2.08)	26 more per 1,000 (from 101 fewer to 177 more)	⊕⊕© LOW	CRITICAL
Percentage o	f participants who liv	ed in one residence	in the last 3 months	(Upshur 2015) (fo	llow up: 6 months)							
1	randomised trials	serious ⁹	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	9/40 (22.5%)	16/36 (44.4%)	OR 0.36 (0.13 to 0.97)	221 fewer per 1,000 (from 350 fewer to 8 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Percentage o	f participants who liv	ed in three residence	ces or more in the las	st 3 months (Upshu	r 2015) (follow up: 6	6 months)						
1	randomised trials	serious ^g	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	12/40 (30.0%)	3/36 (8.3%)	OR 4.71 (1.20 to 18.39)	216 more per 1,000 (from 15 more to 542 more)	⊕⊕(↓) LOW	CRITICAL
Mean Numbe	r of days in stable re	esidence (Sosin 1999	5) (follow up: 6 mont	hs)								
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^c	none	-	-	increases reside	ement intervention ential stability by a icant 9 days (8.650; p<0.05)	⊕⊕(J) LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Me	ental Health											
Percentage o	f participants with po	ositive depression sy	mptoms (Upshur 20	15) (follow up: 6 m	onths)							
1	randomised trials	serious ^g	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	12/37 (32.4%	20/36 (55.6%)	OR 0.38 (0.14 to 0.99)	234 fewer per 1,000 (from 407 fewer to 2 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Qu	uality of Life											
Change in ov	verall life fulfillment us	ing the Life Fulfilmer	nt Scale (LFS) (Grah	am-Jones 2004) (f	follow-up: 3 months)						
1	Observational studies	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious °	none	75 (Health centre: 22; Outreach: 53)	42	Control: 0.3 +/- 23.6 Health centre: 13.3 Outreach: 16.9 +/- 2 Analysis of variance significantly more imp (Bonferroni-corrected outreach advocacy of the control group	+/- 18.8 0.5 (P < 0.001): provement I P < 0.05) in the	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Su	bstance Use											
Problematic a	lcohol use for partici	pants with 5-11 eme	ergency department	visits (Shumway 20	008) (follow up:6 mo	onths)						

1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	18/78 (23.1%)	19/40 (47.5%)	OR 0.33 (0.14 to 0.74)	245 fewer per 1,000 (from 363 fewer to 74 fewer)	EXECUTE LOW	CRITICAL
Problematic a	alcohol use for partic	pants with 12 or mo	re emergency depar	rtment visits (Shumv	way 2008) (follow u	p:6 months)						
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	28/88 (31.8%)	25/45 (55.6%)	OR 0.37 (0.17 to 0.78)	239 fewer per 1,000 (from 380 fewer to 62 fewer)	DD CC LOW	CRITICAL
Number of da	ays participants used	other drugs in the la	ast 3 months (Upshu	r 2015) (follow up:	6 months)							
1	randomised trials	serious ^g	not serious	not serious	Serious ^c	none	40	36	-	MD 12.9 more (3.26 more to 22.53 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Average days	s of alcohol and drug	g consumption (Sosin	1995) (follow up: 1:	2 months)								
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^c	none	-	•	decreased the repo alcohol and drug modest, but significa p<0.05) Sub-an consumption was lo have higher levels of t=-3.24; p<0.01) and (0.221; t=2.25; p<0.01) levels of depressio p<0.05) at baseline	nt 2.5 days (t=-2.01; alysis: Substance wer for subjects who is elf-esteem (-0.305; lower levels of anxiety 05), as well as, higher n (-0.657; t=-2.03; c. Consumption was th greater involvement em (8.028; t=2.96;	⊕⊕C/C LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: En	nployment problems (Conrad 1	998) (follow-up: 24	months)									
1	Randomised	Serious ^d	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^e	none	178	180	Both groups experier	ced fewer	00 00	CRITICAL
	trials								employment problems experimental group e	s with time. The ffects were ring the entire 2-year	LOW	
Employment	status "currently emp	oloyed" (Weinreb 20	16) (follow-up:6 mo	nths)								
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^d	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	7/21 (33.3%)	2/13 (15.4%)	OR 2.75 (0.47 to 15.96)	179 more per 1,000 (from 75 fewer to 590 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Employment	status "part time or f	ull time" (Nyamathi 2	016) (follow-up: 12	months)								
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^f	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	53/166 (31.9%)	63/186 (33.9%)	OR 0.92 (0.59 to 1.43)	18 fewer per 1,000 (from 107 fewer to 84 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: In	come											
Percentage	of participants v	vith no social sec	urity income (SS	I/SSA/SSD) (Pr	rior ED visits: ≥1	2 group) (Shumwa	y 2008) (follow (up: 18 months)				
1 Explanation	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	23/58 (39.7%)	20/27 (74.1%)	OR 0.23 (0.08 to 0.63)	344 fewer per 1,000 (from 555 fewer to 98 fewer)	EW LOW	CRITICAL

- Explanations
 a. High risk of performance bias, and unclear risk of detection bias
 b. Too few events (<300)
 c. Too few participants (<400)
 d. Unclear risk of selection bias and detection bias, high risk for performance bias.
 e. Point estimates and confidence intervals not provided
 f. High risk of performance bias and reporting bias
 g. Unclear risk of selection bias and attrition bias, high risk for performance bias.

Appendix 5.2: ICM GRADE Evidence Profile

			Certainty assessr	ment			Nº of pa	atients	Effe	ect	Certainty	Importance
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Case Management	Comparison	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Outcome: Ho	using Stability									•		
Number of da	ys homeless (Cox 19	998, Grace 2014, To	oro 1997) (Follow up	: 13+ months)								
3	Randomised trials	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	none	358	308	-	SMD 0.22 fewer (0.4 fewer to 0.03 fewer)	LOW	CRITICAL
Proportion of p	participants housed	(Korr 1996) (Follow-	up: 6 months)									
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^D	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^c	none	36/48 (75%)	15/44 (34.1%)	OR 5.80 (2.35 to 14.31)	409 more per 1,000 (from 208 more to 540 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Time spent or	n the street (Shern 2	2000) (Follow-up: 24	months)									
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^e	none	91	77	-	MD 26.71 fewer (39.21 fewer to 14.2 fewer)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Time spent in	shelters (Shern 200	0) (Follow-up: 24 m	onths)									
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^e	none	91	77	-	MD 20.29 more (13.38 more to 27.19 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Time spent in	community housing	(Shem 2000) (Follow	w-up:24 months)	1	•			!				
1	Randomised trials	Serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^e	none	91	77	-	MD 11.07 more (1.52 more to 20.61 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Me	ntal Health											
Psychiatric syr	mptoms using the Ma	anchester Scale (Ma	rshall 1995) (Follow	r-up: 14 months)								
1	randomised trials	Serious [†]	not serious	not serious	serious ^e	none	40	40	·	MD 0.75 higher (1 lower to 2.5 higher)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Psychiatric syr	mptoms using the SC	L-90-R (Toro 1997	(Follow-up: 18 mor	nths)								
1	randomised trials	Serious ⁹	not serious	not serious	Serious o	none	54	51		MD 0.19 fewer (0.37 fewer to 0.006 fewer)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Psychiatric syr	mptoms using the C	olorado Symptom In	dex (Shern 2000) (I	Follow-up: 24 mont	hs)							
1	randomised trials	serious ^d	not serious	not serious	serious ®	none	97	77	-	MD 0.32 fewer (0.53 fewer to 0.1 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Su	bstance Use											
Number	un af also bed	th	- (0 4000) // "									
Number of da	lys of alconol use in	the previous 30 day	s (Cox 1998) (follow	up: ισ months)								
1	randomised trials	Serioush	not serious	not serious	not serious º	none	108	85	-	MD 4.0 fewer (7.41 fewer to 0.58 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	IMPORTANT
Addiction Seve	erity Index (ASI) alco	hol composite score	(Cox 1998) (tollow	-up: 6 months)	•					•		
1	randomised trials	Serious ^h	not serious	not serious	not serious e	none	108	85	-	MD 0.08 lower (0.15 lower to 0.0009 lower)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	IMPORTANT
Outcome: Qu	ality of Life											

Quality of life u	sing Lehman's QOL	.I (Marshall 1995) (F	ollow-up: 14 months	s)								
1	randomised trials	serious [†]	not serious	not serious	serious ^e	none	40	40	-	MD 0.0 (0.42 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Life satisfaction	n in 7 life areas using	g Lehman's QOLI (S	hem 2000) (Follow	-up: 24 months)								
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^e	none	91	77	Individuals in the condition reported or improvement in life their peers in the corthe 7 life areas (0 Leisure, p=0.027; Fi Safety, p=0.005; H Family, p=0.005;	onsistently greater satisfaction than introl group in 6 of verall, p=0.001; nancial, p=0.006;	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Inco	ome											
Public income (US\$) in the last 30	days (Cox 1998) (Fo	bllow-up: 18 months	s)								
1	randomised trials	Serious ^h	not serious	not serious	not serious ^e	none	105	85	-	MD 89 higher (7.59 higher to 170.4 higher)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	IMPORTANT
Income "from o	ther sources" (Toro	1997) (Follow-up: 1	2 months)									
1	randomised trials	Serious ^g	not serious	not serious	Serious *	none	54	51		MD 901 higher (110.99 higher to 1691 higher)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	IMPORTANT

CI: Confidence interval; SMD: Standardised mean difference; OR: Odds ratio; MD: Mean difference

Explanations

- a. Two trials with unclear selection bias and one trial with high risk for selection bias (non randomised). Two trials with undear detection bias, one trial with high risk of detection bias. Two studies with high risk of attrition bias. b. Unclear risk of selection bias, high risk of performance bias, unclear risk of detection bias, and high risk of attrition bias

- c. Small sample size, <100 events, wide confidence interval
 d. Unclear selection bias, unclear detection bias, and high risk for performance bias
- e.Small sample size, <300 participants
- f.. Unclear risk of selection bias (allocation concealment), detection bias, and attrition bias. High risk of performance bias
- g. Unclear risk of selection bias, high risk of performance bias and detection bias h. Unclear risk of selection and detection bias, and a high risk of attrition bias

Appendix 5.3: ACT GRADE Evidence Profile

Outcome: Housing St Number of days homel 1 Rar trial: Number of days homel	neless on streets andomised als neless in the prev	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious 12 months)	Imprecision Serious ^b	Other considerations	Case Management	Comparison 75	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI) MD 14.2 fewer (28.75 fewer to 0.35 more)	⊕ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Number of days homel Rar trial Number of days homel	neless on streets andomised als neless in the prev	Very serious a ious month (Morse	Not serious 1992) (Follow-up:	Not serious 12 months)	Serious ^b	none	77	75	·	(28.75 fewer to		CRITICAL
1 Rar trials Number of days homel	andomised ials neless in the prev	Very serious a ious month (Morse	Not serious 1992) (Follow-up:	Not serious 12 months)	Serious ^b	none	77	75		(28.75 fewer to		CRITICAL
Number of days homel	ials neless in the prev	ious month (Morse	1992) (Follow-up: 1	12 months)	Serious ^b	none	77	75	-	(28.75 fewer to		CRITICAL
1 Rar	andomised	,	, , ,	,					i	1 ' 1		
		Serious °	Not serious							'		•
				Not serious	Serious ^b	none	52	62	-	MD 8.11 days fewer (12.32 fewer to 3.89 fewer)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Number of days home	neless in shelter (I	Lehman 1997) (fol	low up:12 months)									1
1 Rar trials	andomised ials	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	77	75	-	MD 6.2 fewer (9.5 fewer to 2.89 fewer)	⊕◯◯ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Number of days in com	ommunity housing	g (Lehman 1997) (follow up: 12 months	s)	l .					!		
1 Rar	andomised ials	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	77	75	-	MD 50.1 more (46.15 more to 54.04 more)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Number of days in stab	able housing in p	orevious month (Mo	orse 2006) (Follow-u	up:24 months)								•
1 Rar	andomised ials	Serious ^d	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	54	49	-	MD 5.7 days more (0.59 more to 10.8 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Mental Hea	ealth											

1	Randomised trials	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	77	75	-	MD 6 higher (0.73 higher to 11.26 higher)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Psychiatric sympt	toms using the Brief	Psychiatric Rating	Scale (BPRS) (Mors	se 2006) (Follow-up	o: 24 months)							
1	Randomised trials	Serious d	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	54	49	-	MD 0.03 higher (0.17 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Qualit	ty of life				l							
Overall quality of	ilife using Lehman's	QOLI (Essock 199	8) Follow-up: 18 m	onths								
1	Randomised trials	serious	not serious	not serious	serious ^o	none	131	131	The difference be SCM clients on the quality of life all facondition, with a half point or less, components reac significance [no fi	te components of twored the ACT difference of one- and three thes statistical	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Subst	tance use	•		•	•				•			
Ounces of alcoho	ol consumption per	week (Morse 1992)) (tollow-up: 12 mon	iths)								
1	Randomised trials	Serious °	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	52	62	-	MD 1.88 higher (0.64 lower to 4.4 higher)	LOW	IMPORTANT
Outcome: Hospi	italization	!	•			•			!	•		
Mean number of	emergency depart	ment visits (Lehman	1997) (Follow-up: 1	12 months)								
1	Randomised trials	Very serious ^a	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	77	75	-	MD 1.2 fewer (2.03 fewer to 0.36 fewer)	⊕◯◯ VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

Explanations

- a. High risk of performance bias, attrition bias and reporting bias. Unclear risk of selection bias and detection bias.
 b. Small sample size (<300 participants)
- c. Unclear risk of selection bias (random sequence generation and allocation concealment), high risk of performance bias (blinding), and unclear risk of detection bias (outcome assessment) d. High risk of performance bias, unclear risk of selection and detection bias

Appendix 5.4: CTI GRADE Evidence Profile

			Certainty assessme	ent			Ne of p	atients		Effect	Certainty	Importance
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Case Management	Comparison	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Outcome: Hou	using Stability											
Odds of home	lessness at the end	d of the follow-up per	iod (the final three six-	week intervals) (Hem	nan 2011) (follow	up: 18 months)						
1	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	3/58 (5.2%)	11/59 (18.6%)	OR 0.22 (0.06 to 0.88)	138 fewer per 1,000 (from 173 fewer to 19 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Mean number	of: days rehoused	(De Vet 2017) (follow	up:9 months)									
1	randomised trials	serious °	not serious	not serious	Serious d	none	80	82	-	MD 8.29 fewer (22.79 fewer to 6.21 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	CRITICAL
Percentage of	participants who w	ere homeless at the	last month of trial (Sus	ser 1997) (follow up:	18 months)							
1	randomised trials	serious ^e	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	4/48 (8.3%)	11/48 (22.9%)	OR 0.30 (0.08 to 1.04)	147 fewer per 1,000 (from 206 fewer to 7 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊃ LOW	CRITICAL
Odds of exten	ded homelessness	- more than 54 night	ts (Susser 1997) (follo	w up: 18 months)								1
1	randomised trials	serious ^e	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	10/48 (20.8%)	19/48 (39.6%)	OR 0.40 (0.16 to 0.99)	188 fewer per 1,000 (from 301 fewer to 2 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Mer	ntal Health		L									
Psychological	symptoms measure	d as BSI Global Seve	erity Index (De Vet 20)17) (follow up: 9 mor	nths)							
1	randomised trials	serious °	not serious	not serious	Serious d	none	85	77	-	MD 0.13 lower (0.29 lower to 0.03 higher)	⊕⊕ LOW	CRITICAL
Outcome: Qua	ality of Life											
Quality of life u	ısing Lehman's Brie	f Quality of Life Inter	view (De Vet 2017) (f	follow up: 9 months)								

randomised trials	serious °	not serious	not serious	Serious ^d	none	90	83	-	MD 0.18 higher (0.2 lower to 0.56 higher)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	CRITICAL
stance use											
drinks/day) use of	alcohol in a 30 day p	eriod; assessed with t	he European Addictio	n Severity Index	(De Vet 2017) (follow	v-up:9 months)					
randomised trials	serious °	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	19/87 (21.8%)	21/80 (26.3%)	OR 0.78 (0.38 to 1.59)	45 fewer per 1,000 (from 143 fewer to 99 more)	LOW	IMPORTANT
is In a 30 day perio	od; assessed with the	European Addiction	Severity Index (De V	et 2017) (follow -u	p:9 months)						
randomised trials	serious °	not serious	not serious	Serious ^b	none	13/87 (14.9%)	18/80 (22.5%)	OR 0.60 (0.27 to 1.33)	77 fewer per 1,000 (from 152 fewer to 54 more)	LOW	IMPORTANT
pitalization											
ospitalization at th	e end of the follow-u	pperiod (the final thre	e six-week intervals)	(Tomita 2012) (fo	llow-up: 18 months)						
Randomised trials	Serious ^f	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ^b	none	NR	NR	OR 0.11 (0.01 to 0.96)	Not estimable	⊕⊕CC LOW	IMPORTANT
ome											•
in the first nine ma	onths (Jones 2003) (follow up: 9 months)									
randomised trials	serious e	not serious	not serious	Serious ^d	none	47	44		MD 85 more (110.44 fewer to 280.44 more)	⊕⊕○○ LOW	IMPORTANT
in the second nin	e months (Jones 200	3) (follow up: 18 mont	hs)								
randomised trials	serious e	not serious	not serious	Serious ^d	none	47	44		MD 27 more (198.36 fewer to 252.36 more)	LOW	IMPORTANT
	trials stance use drinks/day) use of randomised trials is In a 30 day perior randomised trials pitalization ospitalization at the Randomised trials in the first nine more randomised trials in the second nin randomised	trials stance use drinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day p randomised trials is In a 30 day period; assessed with the randomised trials pitalization spitalization at the end of the follow-u Randomised trials Serious ' spitalization at the end of the follow-u randomised trials in the first nine months (Jones 2003) (randomised trials in the second nine months (Jones 2000) randomised serious ' serious '	trials stance use drinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the randomised trials serious on the follow-up period (the final three strials pitalization aspitalization at the end of the follow-up period (the final three strials Randomised trials Residus on the follow-up period (the final three strials where in the first nine months (Jones 2003) (follow up: 9 months) randomised trials in the second nine months (Jones 2003) (follow up: 18 months) randomised serious on the serious in the second nine months (Jones 2003) (follow up: 18 months) randomised serious on the serious onto serious randomised serious on the serious onto serious	trials stance use drinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction randomised trials serious on the serious of trials is In a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Visitals of trials of the follow-up period (the final three six-week intervals) Randomised trials of the follow-up period (the final three six-week intervals) Randomised Serious of trials	trials stance use drinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index randomised trials solverity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-under an another serious and serious are randomised trials randomised trials serious are not serious are not serious are randomised trials pitalization spitalization Randomised Serious are Not serious are randomised trials serious are not serious are randomised trials Not serious are randomised trials serious are randomised serious are randomised trials serious are randomised serious are randomised trials randomised serious are randomised serious are randomised trials randomised serious are rando	stance use drinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow randomised trials serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the Serious of trials Randomised Serious on the Follow-up period (the final three six-week intervals) (Tomita 2012) (follow-up: 18 months) Randomised Serious on the Serious	stance use Strinks/day) use of alcohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious on the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) Randomised Serious on the Follow-up period (the final three six-week intervals) (Tomita 2012) (follow-up: 18 months) Randomised Serious on the Follow-up period (the final three six-week intervals) (Tomita 2012) (follow-up: 18 months) randomised serious on the Follow up: 9 months) randomised serious on the Follow up: 9 months) randomised serious on the Follow up: 18 months) randomised serious on the Follow up: 18 months) randomised serious on the Follow up: 18 months)	trials and onesed serious and the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised trials serious not serious not serious serious none 19/87 (21.8%) 21/80 (26.3%) and a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomised serious not serious not serious serious none 13/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) and serious serious not serious serious serious none 13/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) pitalization serious Not serious Not serious Serious none NR NR NR randomised Serious Not serious Not serious Serious none NR NR NR in the first nine months (Jones 2003) (follow up: 9 months) randomised serious not serious not serious Serious none 47 44 randomised serious not serious not serious Serious none 47 44 randomised serious not serious not serious Serious none 47 44	trials and omised serious and serious not serious not serious serious and serious and serious serious and seri	trials (2) (2) Lower to 0.56 higher) stance use Trinks/day) use of atohol in a 30 day period; assessed with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) Trandomised trials serious not serious not serious Serious none 19/87 (21.8%) 21/80 (26.3%) OR 0.78 (0.38 to 1.59) 45 fewer per 1,000 (from 14.3 fewer b 99 more) Trandomised serious not serious not serious Serious none 13/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) OR 0.60 (0.27 to 1.33) 77 fewer per 1,000 (from 15.2 fewer b 94 more) Trandomised serious Not serious Not serious Serious none 13/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) OR 0.60 (0.27 to 1.33) 77 fewer per 1,000 (from 15.2 fewer b 94 more) Trandomised Serious Not serious Not serious Serious none NR NR NR OR 0.11 (0.01 to 0.96) Not estimable trials none Trandomised Serious not serious not serious Serious Serious none 47 44	traise with the European Addiction Severity Index (De Vet 2017) (follow-up: 9 months) randomized before: Included serious not serious serious Serious Serious none 19/87 (21.8%) 21/80 (26.3%) OR 0.78 (0.38 to 1.59) or 9 months) randomized serious not serious not serious Serious Serious none 19/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) OR 0.68 (0.38 to 1.59) or 9 months) randomized Serious not serious not serious Serious Serious none 13/87 (14.9%) 18/80 (22.5%) OR 0.68 (0.27 to 1.33) or 15.9 or 9 months) Randomized Serious Not serious Serious Serious Serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Not serious Serious Not serious

CI: Confidence interval; SMD: Standardised mean difference; OR: Odds ratio; MD: Mean difference, NR: Not reported

Explanations

- a. . High risk of selection bias and blinding of participants and personnel
 b. Less than 100 events
 c. High risk of blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), and high risk of blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
 d. Small sample size (<300 participants)
 e. Unclear risk of selection and high risk of performance bias.
 f. High risk of selection bias and performance bias